RECEIVED
NOV 16 1999

MR. MAYS: I'm Wallace Mays. Thanks for the opportunity to speak here today.

27

1 (cont. page 4) I'm speaking in the support of the Yucca Mountain project. I have some written remarks that I'll leave with you. I just want to summarize them, some of the high points, not try to take up too much of your time.

1 continued on page 4

In the way of background, I'm a registered professional engineer. I've got a master of science degree and chemical engineering from the University of Texas. Because I took some nuclear physics I was a nuclear weapons officer in the Navy and as such I served as nuclear weapons officer in the U.S. Navy about 30 miles south of Hiroshima. Some of my friends were survivors of Hiroshima and survived a lot of radiation. I'm pretty familiar with that. These people were the database for the health effects of radiation.

Since that experience I've worked as a chemical engineer and in design, construction, and operations. I've been involved in producing energy and providing jobs in this country for 40 years, and in protecting the environment for 40 years in these facilities.

Among the things I've done is design the refinery units at this Colony oil shelter project. I'm very familiar with energy economics, with oil refining,

2

gas processing, coal mining. But primarily for the last 25 years I've been involved in developing and permitting and reclaiming uranium mines.

In doing this permitting of these mines we're involved in the process much like we are today where we have to gather the data and make plans to protect the environment.

I think I've got some general observations. I haven't reviewed this in detail like some of the speakers have, but I want to say that I am confident in our engineers in this society, and I'm confident that we can solve our technical problems. I'm confident in the process we're involved in here that we'll come to a resolution of this.

2 I am also confident that the public should be reassured that you can count on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the EPA to provide procedure and fairly careful oversight of this program.

We know a lot about radiation. Radiation is better understood, more easily measured than the chemical hazards which we are all involved with. We live in a radioactive world. We are very highly regulated, required internationally to protect public health and safety and the environment to levels of radiation that are as low as reasonably achievable. In

the nuclear industry we're able to keep annual radiation exposure to our employees to less than one twenty-fifth of one dental x-ray.

A good example is the state capitol of Texas made out of pink granite. It's more radioactive than the low-level waste.

We understand very well the geology and the groundwater movement of the Yucca Mountain site. I've got considerable experience with groundwater. I've just finished reclaiming two miles of groundwater aquifer in Texas contaminated with radionuclides. Also I have considerable experience reclaiming the surface contaminated with radionuclides.

1 continued page 6

Based on my review of the summary, I have no problem with this project from a technical standpoint. As far as the cost analysis and socio-economic benefit, I think this facility should be constructed.

3 continued on page 5

You should consider the entire impact on our society and the environment on a national basis. Without this facility, nuclear power would not be a viable source of energy in the United States. Without nuclear power, the United States will not meet its greenhouse emission targets set by the Kyoto accords and meet our treaty requirements.

Nuclear power, properly managed, has demonstrated it's the lowest cost source of energy feasible in industrial except for hydroelectric. Only hydroelectric and nuclear power are free of greenhouse gas emissions.

In considering the environmental impact of a source of energy, the entire impact of producing the energy should be considered. That includes surface area required to produce energy, the resource consumed in that production, the emissions, and disposal of the waste.

Of all significant sources of energy it is my opinion that nuclear power has less overall impact on the environment. Even a very small uranium mine produces more energy than the largest oil and gas field in North America and refineries in North America, and more than the largest coal mines in America.

Of course the impact on river systems compared to hydrologic systems is nonexistent; we don't consume any river resources.

Total volume of waste from producing nuclear power is much less than oil and coal. Burning any hydrocarbon, oil and gas or even wood, produces greenhouse gases. Despite Three-Mile Island and the emotional responses to it, nuclear power is still the

3 continued on page 6

31

3 continued

cheapest and cleanest next to hydroelectric.

The extreme minimal impact of Yucca Mountain and supporting the waste disposal of the source of 20 percent of this nation's electricity demonstrates the importance of this project to the environment and our national economy. Let's try to keep it all in perspective. Thank you.

1 continued

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Fletcher Newton.